Candidate Name:

|  | **Level 1****Not Acceptable****(< 35 pts)** | **Level 2****Needs Improvement****(35-40 pts)**  | **Level 3****Meets Standards****(40-45 pts)** | **Level 4****Exceeds Standards****(45-50 pts)**  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Candidate Identifies main Issue of the Case Study**NELP: 1.2, 4.4, 6.2, 7.4 | Candidate inadequately defines the scope of the case study which results in an accurate identification of the issue:* No clear description of the issue;
* Narrative does not adequately define the scope of the case study;
 | Candidate demonstrates an implicit link between the case study and the issue:* Problem is not well defined;
* Main issue is somewhat defined;
* The response partially addresses the issue at hand;
 | Candidate uses the narrative to accurately describe the issue. Yet, does not operationally define issue:* Description of the issue is clearly defined in the narrative;
* Response generally fulfills the purpose of the case study based upon data use;
* Description is accurate and prevalent to the narrative;
 | Candidate uses information derived from the case study to accurately identify the issue:* The main issue is completely addressed and well defined;
* Main issue is accurately portrayed to the reader through use of data inside the case study;
* Student is able to decipher situation to accurately identify main issue;
 |
| **Rating =**  |  |  |  |  |
| **Candidate Analyzes the main Issue(s)**NELP: 1.2, 2.1-2.2, 3.1, 4.1, 6.2 | Candidate does not identify main issue:* Student does not define or address the issue within the case study;
* Response fulfills little of the intended item within the scenario;
* Breakdown of issue is not prevalent;
 | Candidate identifies the main issue but does not provide an effective or complete analysis:* Analysis is not well addressed or defined/
* The analysis is partially addressed but main components are lacking;
* Some components are addressed but main issue is lacking;
 | Candidate defines the main issue in a general way with smaller components missing:* Issue is defined in a general way to address the task within the case study;
* Analysis of the main issue is addressed with some smaller components lacking;
* Analysis recognizes needed supports that need to be implemented;
 | Candidate effectively analyzes main issue in the case study:* Analysis of the main issue is addressed and defined;
* Analysis of issue is accurately defined and prevalent;
* Well defined issue that addresses the main issue and sub parts of the issue is evident;
 |
| **Rating = /** |  |  |  |  |
| **Candidate addresses an Action Plan and responds appropriately to each specific task within the plan)**NELP: 2.2, 3.2, 5.1-5.3, 6.3, 7.4 | * Candidate’s Action plan is not clear and Systematic;
* Candidate’s Action plan is not guided by relevant theories and processes;
* Candidate’s Description of action/intervention is not present or unclear;
 | * Candidate’s Action plans for addressing the initial problem are clear **or** systematic but not both;
* Candidate’s Action and assessment plans are marginally guided by relevant educational leadership practices;
* Candidate thoughts are not well thought through in terms of the educational leadership;
 | * Candidate’s Action plan is clear and identifiable;
* Candidate’s Action plan provides relevant content knowledge and proven strategies;
* Candidate’s Data is evident and action plan is derived from a collaborative approach with stakeholders;
 | * Candidate’s Action plan is well defined and derived from content knowledge and skills acquired including ethical and legal standards;
* Candidate’s action plan benefited from collaborating with diverse stakeholders in addressing the issue;
* Candidate’s Action plan provides examples and specific items relevant to educational leadership;
 |
| **Rating = /** |  |  |  |  |
| **Candidate uses EDL Terminology and applies Relevant Content Knowledge**NELP: 4.3, 5.2, 6.2 | Candidate response has the following items:* EDL terms and content knowledge is not evident;
* Data used is not noticeable and reinforced in the writing;
* EDL Terminology is non-existent;
 | Candidate response has the following items:* EDL terms are somewhat prevalent and identifiable;
* Terms are limited and only partially used in the response;
* Partial interpretation of data;
 | Candidate response has the following components:* EDL terms are used and are appropriate for the purpose and scope of the study;
* EDL terms are used effectively and accurately in the case study response;
* EDL terms are evident but not total defined within a collaborative approach to the case study;
 | * Candidate response completely fulfills the assignment by the use of multiple EDL terms accurately and content knowledge is prevalent;
* Candidate shows a collaboration of all stakeholders;
* Candidate uses EDL terms and content knowledge to help provide an accurate solution to the case study;
 |
| **Rating = /** |  |  |  |  |
| **Candidate applies appropriate level writing in their response**NELP: 1.2, 4.1, 5.2, 5.3 | * Answer is not accurately written;
* EDL language not used;
* Poorly organized;
* Unclear;
 | Some but not all of the following:* demonstrates ability to use academic language;
* clear focus, well organized;
* conceptual clarity;
 | * Demonstrates ability to use academic language;
* Clear focus, well organized;
* Conceptual clarity;
* Length may not fall into the required number of words;
 | * Clearly developed answer that produces well rounded answer in the allotted length;
* Concepts and knowledge is prevalent in the writing;
* Well organized answer;
 |
| **Rating = /** |  |  |  |  |
| **Total points =****\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  |  |  |  |  |
| **COMMENTS** |  |